

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2, 7 and 12 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 8 and 9 are amended herein.

Claims 7, 8 and 12 are "objected to."

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13 and 14 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In item 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are "objected to." The Examiner indicates that the feedforward look-up table of claim 2, the phase lead-lag controller of claim 4, and the reference and actual signals of claim 5 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claims. FIG. 2 is amended herein to show a feedforward look-up table 250 and a phase lead-lag controller 260. However, the Applicant traverses the drawing objection regarding the reference and actual signals of claim 5 because the claimed features are shown in FIG. 2 and described at lines 5-9 of paragraph 0017 of the Applicant's specification. In view of the attached "REPLACEMENT SHEET" of FIG. 2, the outstanding drawing objection should be resolved.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY FUJIUNE ET AL. (USP# 6,498,772)

Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein to include the features of the allowable claims 7 and 12, respectively. Thus, claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art and define allowable subject matter.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY YU ET AL. (USP# 6,147,467)

Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein to include the features of the allowable claims 7 and 12, respectively. Thus, claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art and define

allowable subject matter.

Claims 3 and 6, and claim 11 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. Thus, for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 9 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is submitted that claims 3, 6 and 11 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

Claims 13 and 14 recite, “generating and outputting a control value to compensate for eccentricity at varying reproduction speeds depending on a phase of the spindle that rotates the disk” and “adjusting gain and phase of the control value at a reproduction speed of the disk based on frequency response characteristics of the actuator.”

Yu discloses a dynamic compensator 73, which is used in a servo loop for an optical disk player. The Examiner refers to column 5, line 58 – column 6, line 6 of Yu, which discloses, “through the selection of a second-order or third-order filter transfer function embodied within the electronic-type dynamic compensator 73, one could tune the resonant frequency of the optical pickup head 79 close to or substantially equal to the nominal spin frequency of the disk player. Furthermore, adequate damping ratio can also be obtained through the selection of the second-order or third-order filter transfer function such that the dynamic response of the optical pickup head 79 at the nominal spin frequency has higher gain than the conventional approach. As an example, the gain of one conventional approach at the nominal spin frequency is 39 dB and the gain of the present invention at the nominal spin frequency is 55 dB, shown in FIG. 8. As the result, the invention counterbalances the effect of eccentricity of the optical disk by escalating the gain at the nominal spin frequency.”

However, nothing in the Yu reference discloses or suggests adjusting gain and phase of the control value at a reproduction speed of the disk based on frequency response characteristics of the actuator as recited in claims 13 and 14. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Yu does not disclose the features recited in claims 13 and 14.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER FUJUNE IN VIEW OF DROUIN (USP# 5,550,685)

Claim 2 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reason that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is submitted that claim 10 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4 AND 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER YU IN VIEW OF TAKESHITA ET AL. (USP# 5,479,386)

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reason that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is submitted that claims 4 and 5 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-15-04

By: 
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501